

1
2
3
4 STEVE DALE PERCELLE,
5 Plaintiff,
6 v.
7 S. PEARSON, et al.,
8 Defendants.
9

10 Case No. 12-cv-05343-TEH (EDL)
11

12 **ORDER RE REDACTIONS**

13 Re: Dkt. No. 166, 189
14

15 On February 2, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel production of documents. (Dkt.
16 163.) As stated on the record at the March 24, 2015 hearing, that motion, as well as Plaintiff's two
17 other discovery motions (Dkts. 169, 173), were largely resolved by the Parties. However, the
18 Court ordered the Parties to submit supplemental briefing on Plaintiff's objections to Defendants'
19 redactions to a December 8, 2010 e-mail (with attachments) sent to Defendant Arredondo and
20 ordered Defendants to submit that document for in-camera review. (Dkt. 166 (Dresser Decl.) Ex.
21 HH.)¹ Only Defendants timely submitted supplemental briefing. They argue that the redactions
22 are proper to conceal the identities of a confidential informant and other inmates, but consent to
23 producing the e-mail sender's name. (See Dkt. 189.)

24 Upon consideration of all the briefing submitted to the Court, oral argument, and in-camera
25 review of the document, the Court finds that the majority of Defendants' redactions are proper
26 because they are necessary to safeguard the identity of the confidential informant and other
27 individuals referenced in the document. (See Dkt. 77 (stipulated protective order requiring the
28 redaction of "information of all non-Plaintiff inmates or parolees").) As Defendants persuasively

¹ Plaintiff's unopposed motion to file this declaration under seal (Dkt. 166) is GRANTED.

1 argue, the disclosure of this information could jeopardize the safety of these individuals.

2 However, Defendants fail to justify their redactions as to the following portions of the
3 document:

4 (1) On page one, both words which comprise line twenty-one of the document (beginning
5 with the "c" and ending with the "n");

6 (2) On page six, line six of the handwritten text (i.e., line 10 from the top of the page, that
7 begins with a typed title line and three lines of typed unredacted text), from the fifth word of the
8 line, which begins with "r," to, and including, the twentieth word of the line, which ends with "e";
9 and

10 (3) On page nine, all of the fifth line of handwritten text (beginning with "(c" and ending
11 with "f".

12 Therefore, the Court ORDERS that Defendants produce a version of this document without
13 these redactions and which identifies the e-mail sender's name. Defendants may designate this
14 document as "CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEY'S EYES ONLY." Given Defendants' concern
15 that the confidential informant's handwriting may reveal that person's identity, Defendants may
16 produce a typed version of the handwritten lines of text in lieu of the handwriting itself.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: April 3, 2015

19
20
21 
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge